arXiv:1402.0442v2 [math.CO] 9 Feb 2014

The p-spectral radius of k-partite and k-chromatic uniform hypergraphs*†

L. Kang‡, V. Nikiforov§, and X. Yuan¶

February 11, 2014

Abstract

The p-spectral radius of a uniform hypergraph G of order n is defined for every real number $p \geq 1$ as

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) = \max_{|x_1|^p + \cdots + |x_n|^p = 1} r! \sum_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_r\} \in E(G)} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}.$$

It generalizes several hypergraph parameters, including the Lagrangian, the spectral radius, and the number of edges. The paper presents solutions to several extremal problems about the p-spectral radius of k-partite and k-chromatic hypergraphs of order n. Two of the main results are:

(I) Let $k \geq r \geq 2$, and let G be a k-partite r-graph of order n. For every $p > 1$,

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) < \lambda^{(p)}\left(T_k^r(n)\right),$$

unless $G = T_k^r(n)$, where $T_k^r(n)$ is the complete k-partite r-graph of order n, with parts of size $\lfloor n/k \rfloor$ or $\lceil n/k \rceil$.

(II) Let $k \geq 2$, and let G be a k-chromatic 3-graph of order n. For every $p \geq 1$,

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) < \lambda^{(p)}\left(Q_k^3(n)\right),$$

unless $G = Q_k^3(n)$, where $Q_k^3(n)$ is a complete k-chromatic 3-graph of order n, with classes of size $\lfloor n/k \rfloor$ or $\lceil n/k \rceil$.

The latter statement generalizes a result of Mubayi and Talbot.

1 Introduction

In this paper we study the maximum p-spectral radius of k-partite and k-chromatic uniform hypergraphs of given order.

*AMS MSC: 05C65; 05C35.

†Keywords: *uniform hypergraph; p-spectral radius; k-partite hypergraph; k-chromatic hypergraph.*

‡Department of Mathematics, Shanghai University, Shanghai, 200444, PR China. email: *lykang@shu.edu.cn*

§Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Memphis, Memphis TN 38152, USA; email: *vnikifrv@memphis.edu*

¶Corresponding author, Department of Mathematics, Shanghai University, Shanghai, 200444, PR China. email: *xiyingyuan2007@hotmail.com*

Let us recall the definition of the p-spectral radius of graphs. Suppose that $r \geq 2$ and let G be an r-uniform graph of order n. The *polynomial form* of G is a multilinear function $P_G : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^1$ defined for any vector $[x_i] \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as

$$P_G([x_i]) := r! \sum_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_r\} \in E(G)} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r}.$$

Now, for any real number $p \geq 1$, the *p-spectral radius* of G is defined as

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) := \max_{|x_1|^p + \cdots + |x_n|^p = 1} P_G(\mathbf{x}). \tag{1}$$

Note that $\lambda^{(p)}$ is a multifaceted parameter, as $\lambda^{(1)}(G)$ is the Lagrangian of G, $\lambda^{(r)}(G)$ is its spectral radius, and $\lim_{p\to\infty} \lambda^{(p)}(G) n^{r/p} = r!e(G)$. The p-spectral radius has been introduced in [7] and subsequently studied in [10], [11], and [12].

Next, let us recall a few definitions about k-partite and k-chromatic uniform hypergraphs. Let $k \geq r \geq 2$. An r-graph G is called *k-partite* if its vertex set $V(G)$ can be partitioned into k sets so that each edge contains at most one vertex from each set. An edge maximal k-partite r-graph is called *complete k-partite*. We write $T_k^r(n)$ for the complete k-partite r-graph of order n, with parts of size $\lfloor n/k \rfloor$ or $\lceil n/k \rceil$; note that $T_k^2(n)$ is the Turán graph $T_k(n)$.

Further, an r-graph G is called *k-chromatic* if $V(G)$ can be partitioned into k sets so that no set contains an edge. An edge maximal k-chromatic r-graph is called *complete k-chromatic*. We write $Q_k^r(n)$ for the complete k-chromatic r-graph of order n, with vertex sets of size $\lfloor n/k \rfloor$ or $\lceil n/k \rceil$; note that $Q_k^2(n) = T_k(n)$.

For 2-graphs, relations between the chromatic number and $\lambda^{(p)}$ have been long known. For example, if G is a k-chromatic 2-graph of order n, the result of Motzkin and Straus [8] implies that $\lambda^{(1)}(G) \leq 1 - 1/k$, Cvetković [2] has shown that $\lambda^{(2)}(G) \leq (1 - 1/k) n$, and Edwards and Elphick [3] improved this to $\lambda^{(2)}(G) \leq \sqrt{2(1 - 1/k) e(G)}$. Finally, Feng et al. [5] have shown that $\lambda^{(2)}(G) \leq \lambda^{(2)}(T_k(n))$. In fact, all these inequalities have been improved by replacing the chromatic number with the clique number of G.

However, for hypergraphs there are very few similar results. For example, if G is a k-chromatic 3-graph of order n, Mubayi and Talbot [9] showed that

$$\lambda^{(1)}(G) \leq \lambda^{(1)}\left(Q_k^3(n)\right). \tag{2}$$

Recently, in [10] it was shown that if G is a k-partite r-graph of order n and $p > 1$, then

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) \leq r! \binom{k}{r}^{1/p} k^{-r/p} e(G)^{1-1/p}, \tag{3}$$

and

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) \leq r! \binom{k}{r} k^{-r} n^{r-r/p}. \tag{4}$$

Also, if G is a k-chromatic r-graph of order n and $p > 1$, then

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{k^{r-1}}\right)^{1/p} (r!e(G))^{1-1/p}, \tag{5}$$

and

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{k^{r-1}}\right) n^{r-r/p}. \tag{6}$$

Bounds (3)-(6) are quite tight, in view of the graphs $T_k^r(n)$ and $Q_k^r(n)$, but they can made more precise, as shown in this paper.

The above list leaves quite a few gaps to be filled in. To our surprise, most of these problems turned out to be astonishing challenges, much more complicated than the corresponding results for $\lambda^{(2)}$ of 2-graphs. We solved several problems to a satisfactory level, although our proofs are generally quite long and technical. However, we could not solve two central problems stated below as Conjectures 7 and 8. It is evident that new methods are necessary to attack these conjectures, and we hope to have prepared some ground for them.

We proceed with statement and discussion of our main results, first for $\lambda^{(1)}(G)$ of k-partite r-graphs.

Theorem 1 *Let $k \geq r \geq 2$, and let G be a k-partite r-graph of order n with partition sets $V_1, \ldots, V_k$. Then*

$$\lambda^{(1)}(G) \leq r! \binom{k}{r} k^{-r}. \tag{7}$$

(I) If $[x_i]$ is a positive n-vector such that $x_1 + \cdots + x_n = 1$ and

$$\lambda^{(1)}(G) = P_G([x_i]) = r! \binom{k}{r} k^{-r}, \tag{8}$$

then G is complete k-partite and

$$\sum_{i \in V_j} x_i = \frac{1}{k}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, k. \tag{9}$$

(II) If G is complete k-partite and $[x_i]$ is a nonnegative n-vector satisfying (9), then (8) holds.

Clause *(II)* of Theorem 1 shows that there are many non-isomorphic r-graphs achieving equality in (7). However, this is not the case if $p > 1$, as shown in the following theorem.

Theorem 2 *Let $k \geq r \geq 2$, and let G be a k-partite r-graph of order n. For every $p > 1$,*

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) < \lambda^{(p)}(T_k^r(n)),$$

unless $G = T_k^r(n)$.

Although Theorem 2 is as good as one can get, it is also useful to have explicit bounds which are close to the best possible one. Thus, for reader's sake we shall give self-contained proofs of bounds (3) and (4).

Theorem 3 *Let $k \geq r \geq 2$, and let G be a k-partite r-graph of order n. If $p > 1$, then*

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) \leq r! \binom{k}{r}^{1/p} k^{-r/p} e(G)^{1-1/p}.$$

Also, if $p > 1$, then

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) < r! \binom{k}{r} k^{-r} n^{r-r/p}, \tag{10}$$

unless $k|n$ and $G = T_k^r(n)$.

Note that Theorem 3 requires that $p > 1$, as the conditions for equality are different from those for $\lambda^{(1)}(G)$, as listed in Theorem 1.

We continue with problems for k-chromatic graphs, which are considerably more difficult. The first result extends the bound of Mubayi and Talbot (2).

Theorem 4 *Let $k \geq 2$, and let G be a k-chromatic 3-graph of order n. For every $p \geq 1$,*

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) < \lambda^{(p)}\left(Q_k^3(n)\right),$$

unless $G = Q_k^3(n)$.

Note again that Theorem 4 is very precise, but not explicit; however, it is useful to have explicit bounds that are close to the best possible one, like those given in the next theorem. Recall that K_n^r stands for the complete r-graph of order n.

Theorem 5 *Let $k \geq 2$, let G be a k-chromatic 3-graph of order n, and let $p \geq 1$.*

(I) If $n \leq 2k$, then

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) < 3!\binom{n}{3}n^{-3/p},$$

unless $G = K_n^3$.

(II) If $n > 2k$, then

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) < 3!\left(\binom{n}{3} - k\binom{n/k}{3}\right)n^{-3/p},$$

unless $k|n$ and $G = Q_k^3(n)$.

It is immediate to extend clause (I) of Theorem 5 for $r > 3$ and $n \leq (r-1)k$. Indeed, if $n \leq (r-1)k$, then

$$\lambda^{(p)}\left(Q_k^r(n)\right) = \lambda^{(p)}\left(K_n^r\right) = r!\binom{n}{r}n^{-r/p}.$$

Hence, for every r-graph G of order n, $\lambda^{(p)}(G) \leq \lambda^{(p)}\left(Q_k^r(n)\right)$, with equality holding if and only if $G = K_n^r$. We arrive thus at the following proposition.

Proposition 6 *Let $k \geq 2$, and let G be a k-chromatic r-graph of order $n \leq (r-1)k$. For every $p \geq 1$,*

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) < r!\binom{n}{r}n^{-r/p},$$

unless $G = K_n^r$.

The above observations show that for a meaningful generalization of Theorems 4 and 5 we should require that $n > (r-1)k$. Unfortunately, our methods are not good to tackle such generalization and so we state two conjectures instead.

Conjecture 7 *Let $k \geq 2$, and let G be a k-chromatic r-graph of order $n > (r-1)k$. For every $p \geq 1$,*

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) < \lambda^{(p)}\left(Q_k^r(n)\right),$$

unless $G = Q_k^r(n)$.

Conjecture 8 *Let $k \geq 2$, let G be a k-chromatic r-graph of order $n > (r-1)k$. For every $p \geq 1$,*

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) < r!\left(\binom{n}{r} - k\binom{n/k}{r}\right) n^{-r/p},$$

unless $k|n$ and $G = Q_k^r(n)$.

Let us note that the difficulty of Conjectures 7 and 8 lies in their level of precision. If cruder estimates are acceptable, then the simple bounds (5) and (6) are good enough and are asymptotically tight. For reader's sake we give self-contained proofs of these bounds.

Theorem 9 *Let $k \geq r \geq 2$, and let G be a k-chromatic r-graph of order n. If $p \geq 1$, then*

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{k^{r-1}}\right)^{1/p} (r!e(G))^{1-1/p}, \tag{11}$$

and

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) < \left(1 - \frac{1}{k^{r-1}}\right) n^{r-r/p}. \tag{12}$$

In the remaining part of the paper we prove Theorems 1-9.

2 Proofs

In the course of our proofs we shall use a number of classical inequalities. Among those are the Power Mean inequality (PM inequality), the Arithmetic Mean - Geometric Mean inequality (AM-GM inequality), the Bernoulli and the Maclaurin inequalities; for reference material, we refer the reader to [6].

For background on hypergraphs we refer the reader to [1]. As usual, if G is an r-graph of order n and $V(G)$ is not defined explicitly, it is assumed that $V(G) = [n] = \{1, \ldots, n\}$; this assumption is crucial for our notation.

All required facts about the p-spectral radius are given below. Additional reference material can be found in [10] and [11]. In particular, if G is an r-graph of order n and $[x_i]$ is an n-vector such that $|x_1|^p + \cdots + |x_n|^p = 1$ and $\lambda^{(p)}(G) = P_G([x_i])$, then $[x_i]$ will be called an *eigenvector* to $\lambda^{(p)}(G)$. Clearly, $\lambda^{(p)}(G)$ always has a nonnegative eigenvector.

The following lemma is useful for well-structured graphs, in particular for complete partite and complete chromatic graphs. It can be traced back to [7].

Lemma 10 *Let G be an r-graph of order n with $E(G) \neq \varnothing$, and let u and v be vertices of G such that the transposition of u and v is an automorphism of G. If $p > 1$ and $[x_i]$ is an eigenvector to $\lambda^{(p)}(G)$, then $x_u = x_v$.*

Proof Note that

$$P_G([x_i]) = x_u A + x_v A + x_u x_v B + C,$$

where A, B, C are independent of x_u and x_v. Assume that $x_u \neq x_v$ and define a vector $[x_i']$ such that

$$x_u' = x_v' = \frac{x_u + x_v}{2}, \text{ and } x_i' = x_i \text{ if } i \in [n] \setminus \{u, v\}.$$

Since $p > 1$, the PM inequality implies that $|x_1'|^p + \cdots + |x_n'|^p < |x_1|^p + \cdots + |x_n|^p = 1$, while

$$P_G\left(\left[x_i'\right]\right) - P_G\left([x_i]\right) = \frac{\left(x_u - x_v\right)^2}{4} B \geq 0,$$

and so,

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) \geq \frac{P_G\left([x_i']\right)}{\left|[x_i']\right|_p^r} > P_G\left(\left[x_i'\right]\right) \geq P_G\left([x_i]\right) = \lambda^{(p)}(G)$$

a contradiction, completing the proof of Lemma 10. □

2.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof Let $\mathbf{x}$ be a nonnegative n-vector such that $|\mathbf{x}|_1 = 1$, $\lambda^{(1)}(G) = P_G(\mathbf{x})$, and $\mathbf{x}$ has minimum number of positive entries. Let m be the number of positive entries of $\mathbf{x}$. We shall show that $m \leq k$. Indeed, if $m > k$, then $\mathbf{x}$ has two positive entries x_i and x_j belonging to the same partition set. Since no edge contains both vertices i and j, we see that

$$P_G(\mathbf{x}) = x_i \frac{\partial P_G(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_i} + x_j \frac{\partial P_G(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} + S,$$

where S does not depend on x_i or x_j. By symmetry, we assume that $\frac{\partial P_G(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_i} \geq \frac{\partial P_G(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j}$ and define the vector $\mathbf{x}'$ by

$$x_i' = x_i + x_j,\ x_j' = 0, \text{ and } x_s' = x_s \text{ for } s \in [n] \setminus \{i, j\}.$$

We see that $|\mathbf{x}'|_1 = 1$ and

$$P_G\left(\mathbf{x}'\right) - P_G(\mathbf{x}) = x_j \left(\frac{\partial P_G(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial P_G(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_j} \right) \geq 0.$$

It follows that $P_G(\mathbf{x}') = P_G(\mathbf{x})$, but $\mathbf{x}'$ has only $m-1$ positive entries, contradicting the choice of $\mathbf{x}$. Hence $m \leq k$. By symmetry, let $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ be the positive entries of $\mathbf{x}$. Now, using Maclaurin's inequality, we see that

$$P_G(\mathbf{x}) \leq r! \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_r \leq m} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r} \leq r! \binom{m}{r} \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} x_i \right)^r = r! \binom{m}{r} m^{-r} \leq r! \binom{k}{r} k^{-r}.$$

This proves the bound (7).

Next, we prove (I). It is clear that G is complete k-partite. Next for $j = 1, \ldots, k$, let

$$y_j = \sum_{i \in V_j} x_i,$$

and using Maclaurin's inequality, we find that

$$P_G(\mathbf{x}) = r! \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_r \leq k} y_{i_1} \cdots y_{i_r} \leq r! \binom{k}{r} \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} y_i \right)^r = r! \binom{k}{r} k^{-r}.$$

The condition for equality of Maclaurin's inequality implies that $y_j = 1/k$ for $j = 1, \ldots, k$, completing the proof of (I). To prove (II), it is enough to notice that

$$\lambda^{(1)}(G) \geq P_G(\mathbf{x}) = r! \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_r \leq k} y_{i_1} \cdots y_{i_r} = r! \binom{k}{r} k^{-r},$$

and (8) follows from (I). Theorem 1 is proved. □

2.2 Proof of Theorem 2

We precede the proof by two propositions, which are not obvious for arbitrary $p > 1$.

Proposition 11 *If G is a complete k-partite r-graph and $p > 1$, then every nonnegative vector to $\lambda^{(p)}(G)$ is positive.*

Proof Let G be a complete k-partite r-graph, let $p > 1$, and $\mathbf{x}$ be a nonnegative eigenvector to $\lambda^{(p)}(G)$. Assume for a contradiction that $\mathbf{x}$ has zero entries. Then, by Lemma 10, all entries within the same partition sets must be equal to 0 as well. Let G' be the graph induced by the vertices with positive entries in $\mathbf{x}$. Clearly G' is complete l-partite, where $r \leq l < k$. If all parts of G' are of size 1, then $G' = K_l^r$ and G contains a K_{l+1}^r; so we have

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) \geq \lambda^{(p)}\left(K_{l+1}^r\right) > \lambda^{(p)}\left(K_l^r\right) = \lambda^{(p)}\left(G'\right) = \lambda^{(p)}(G),$$

a contradiction. Thus G' contains a partition set of size at least 2. Let i belong to a partition set of size at least 2, and let j be a vertex such that x_j is 0, i.e., j does not belong to $V(G')$. Set $x_j = x_i$ and $x_i = 0$ and write $\mathbf{x}'$ for the resulting vector. Obviously $|\mathbf{x}'|_p = 1$, but we shall show that $P_G(\mathbf{x}') > P_G(\mathbf{x})$, which is a contradiction. Indeed, if $\{i_1, \ldots, i_{r-1}\} \subset V(G')$ is such that $\{i, i_1, \ldots, i_{r-1}\} \in E(G')$, then $\{j, i_1, \ldots, i_{r-1}\} \in E(G)$. However, if i' belongs to the same partition as i, there is a set $\{i', i_1, \ldots, i_{r-2}\} \subset V(G')$ such that $\{j, i', i_1, \ldots, i_{r-2}\} \in E(G)$, but $\{i, i', i_1, \ldots, i_{r-2}\} \notin E(G')$; and since $x_j x_{i'} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-2}} > 0$, we see that $P_G(\mathbf{x}') > P_G(\mathbf{x})$. This completes the proof of Proposition 11. □

Proposition 12 *Let $p \geq 1$, and let G be an r-graph such that every nonnegative vector to $\lambda^{(p)}(G)$ is positive. If H is a subgraph of G, then $\lambda^{(p)}(H) < \lambda^{(p)}(G)$, unless $H = G$.*

Proof If $\lambda^{(p)}(H) = \lambda^{(p)}(G)$, then $V(H) = V(G)$, otherwise by adding zero entries, any nonnegative eigenvector to $\lambda^{(p)}(H)$ can be extended to a nonnegative eigenvector to $\lambda^{(p)}(G)$ that is nonpositive, contrary to the assumption. By the same token, if $\mathbf{x}$ is an eigenvector to H, it must be positive. So if H has fewer edges than G, then $\lambda^{(p)}(G) = P_H(\mathbf{x}) < P_G(\mathbf{x})$, a contradiction completing the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 2 Let G be a k-partite r-graph of order n, with maximum p-spectral radius. Proposition 12 implies that G is complete k-partite; let $V_1, \ldots, V_k$ be the partition sets of G. For each $i \in [k]$, set $|V_i| = n_i$ and suppose that $n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_k$. Assume for a contradiction that $n_k - n_1 \geq 2$. To begin with, Proposition 11 implies that $\mathbf{x}$ is a positive eigenvector to $\lambda^{(p)}(G)$

and Lemma 10 implies that all entries belonging to the same partition set are equal. Thus, for each $i \in [k]$, write a_i for the value of the entries in V_i.

Set $c = n_1 a_1^p + n_k a_k^p$ and let

$$S_1 = \sum_{1 < i_1 < \cdots < i_{r-1} < k} n_{i_1} a_{i_1} \cdots n_{i_{r-1}} a_{i_{r-1}},$$
$$S_2 = \sum_{1 < i_1 < \cdots < i_{r-2} < k} n_{i_1} a_{i_1} \cdots n_{i_{r-2}} a_{i_{r-2}}.$$

If $r = 2$, we let $S_2 = 1$.

Suppose first that $n_k + n_1 = 2l$ for some integer l. Let G' be the complete k-partite graph with partition

$$V(G') = V_1' \cup \cdots \cup V_k',$$

where $|V_1'| = |V_k'| = l$, $V_1' \cup V_k' = V_1 \cup V_k$, and $V_i' = V_i$ for each $1 < i < k$. Now, define an n-vector $\mathbf{y}$ which coincides with $\mathbf{x}$ on $V_2 \cup \cdots \cup V_{k-1}$ and for each $i \in V_1' \cup V_k'$ set

$$y_i = (c/2l)^{1/p} = b.$$

Note first that $y_1^p + \cdots + y_n^p = 1$. Further, note that

$$P_{G'}(\mathbf{y}) - P_G(\mathbf{x}) = \left(l^2 b^2 - n_1 n_k a_1 a_k\right) S_2 + (2lb - (n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k)) S_1.$$

We shall prove that

$$l^2 b^2 - n_1 n_k a_1 a_k > 0, \text{ and } 2lb - (n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k) \geq 0,$$

which implies that $P_{G'}(\mathbf{y}) > P_G(\mathbf{x})$.

Indeed, since $l^2 > n_1 n_k$, and $p > 1$, the AM-GM inequality implies that

$$l^2 b^2 = l^2 \left(\frac{n_1 a_1^p + n_k a_k^p}{2l}\right)^{2/p} \geq l^{2-\frac{2}{p}} \left(\sqrt{n_1 a_1^p n_k a_k^p}\right)^{2/p} = \left(\frac{l^2}{n_1 n_k}\right)^{1-1/p} n_1 n_k a_1 a_k$$
$$> n_1 n_k a_1 a_k.$$

On the other hand, the PM inequality implies that

$$2lb = 2l \left(\frac{n_1 a_1^p + n_k a_k^p}{2l}\right)^{1/p} \geq 2l \left(\frac{n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k}{2l}\right) = n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k.$$

Therefore,

$$\lambda^{(p)}\left(G'\right) \geq P_{G'}(\mathbf{y}) > P_G(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda^{(p)}(G),$$

contradicting the choice of G, and completing the proof if $n_k + n_1$ is even.

Suppose now that $n_k + n_1 = 2l + 1$ for some integer l. Let G' be the complete k-partite graph with partition

$$V(G') = V_1' \cup \cdots \cup V_k',$$

where $|V_1'| = l$, $|V_k'| = l + 1$, $V_1' \cup V_k' = V_1 \cup V_k$, and $V_i' = V_i$ for each $1 < i < k$. Now, define an n-vector $\mathbf{y}$ which coincides with $\mathbf{x}$ on $V_2 \cup \cdots \cup V_{k-1}$ and for each $i \in V_1' \cup V_k'$ set

$$y_i = (c/(2l+1))^{1/p} = b.$$

Note first that $y_1^p + \cdots + y_n^p = 1$. Like above,

$$P_{G'}(\mathbf{y}) - P_G(\mathbf{x}) = \left(l(l+1)b^2 - n_1 n_k a_1 a_k\right) S_2 + \left((2l+1)b - (n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k)\right) S_1.$$

We shall prove that

$$(2l+1)b - (n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k) \geq 0,$$

and if $p > 9/8$, then

$$l(l+1)b^2 - n_1 n_k a_1 a_k > 0.$$

Indeed, the first of these inequalities follows by the PM inequality as

$$(2l+1)b = (2l+1)\left(\frac{n_1 a_1^p + n_k a_k^p}{2l+1}\right)^{1/p} \geq (2l+1)\left(\frac{n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k}{2l+1}\right) = n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k.$$

Further, if $p > 9/8$, Bernoulli's inequality entails

$$\left(\frac{(2l+1)^2}{4(l-1)(l+2)}\right)^{1/p} = \left(1 + \frac{9}{4(l-1)(l+2)}\right)^{1/p} \leq 1 + \frac{9}{4p(l-1)(l+2)} < \frac{l(l+1)}{(l-1)(l+2)}.$$

Now, in view of $n_1 n_k \leq (l-1)(l+2)$, the AM-GM inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
l(l+1)b^2 &= l(l+1)\left(\frac{n_1 a_1^p + n_k a_k^p}{2l+1}\right)^{2/p} \\
&\geq l(l+1)\left(\frac{1}{2l+1}\right)^{2/p}\left(2\sqrt{n_1 a_1^p n_k a_k^p}\right)^{2/p} \\
&= l(l+1)\left(\frac{4}{(2l+1)^2}\right)^{1/p}\left(\frac{1}{n_1 n_k}\right)^{1-1/p} n_1 n_k a_1 a_k \\
&\geq l(l+1)\left(\frac{4}{(2l+1)^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}\left(\frac{1}{(l-1)(l+2)}\right)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} n_1 n_k a_1 a_k \\
&= \frac{l(l+1)}{(l-1)(l+2)}\left(\frac{4(l-1)(l+2)}{(2l+1)^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} n_1 n_k a_1 a_k \\
&> n_1 n_k a_1 a_k.
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, if $l(l+1)b^2 - n_1 n_k a_1 a_k > 0$ or if $p > 9/8$, we obtain a contradiction

$$\lambda^{(p)}\left(G'\right) \geq P_{G'}(\mathbf{y}) > P_G(\mathbf{x}) = \lambda^{(p)}(G).$$

To finish the proof we shall consider the case when $p \leq 9/8$ and $l(l+1)b^2 - n_1 n_k a_1 a_k \leq 0$. Clearly, the latter inequality can be rewritten as

$$a_1 a_k \geq \frac{l(l+1)}{n_1 n_k}\left(\frac{c}{2l+1}\right)^{2/p}. \tag{13}$$

Define an n-vector $\mathbf{z}$ which coincides with $\mathbf{x}$ on $V_2 \cup \cdots \cup V_{k-1}$, and for every $i \in V_1'$ and $j \in V_k'$ set

$$\begin{aligned}
z_i &= n_1 a_1 / l = b_1, \\
z_j &= n_k a_k / (l+1) = b_k.
\end{aligned}$$

First note that

$$z_1^p + \cdots + z_n^p = 1 - (n_1 a_1^p + n_k a_k^p) + l b_1^p + (l+1) b_k^p.$$

We also have

$$P_{G'}(\mathbf{z}) - P_G(\mathbf{x}) = (l(l+1) b_1 b_k - n_1 n_k a_1 a_k) S_2 + (l b_1 + (l+1) b_k - (n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k)) S_2 = 0.$$

Noting that

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) = P_G(\mathbf{x}) = P_{G'}(\mathbf{z}) \leq \lambda^{(p)}(G') |\mathbf{z}|_p^r,$$

in view of $\lambda^{(p)}(G') \leq \lambda^{(p)}(G)$, we see that $|\mathbf{z}|_p \geq 1$. Hence

$$l b_1^p + (l+1) b_k^p \geq n_1 a_1^p + n_k a_k^p,$$

and so

$$l \left(\frac{n_1 a_1}{l}\right)^p + (l+1) \left(\frac{n_k a_k}{l+1}\right)^p \geq n_1 a_1^p + n_k a_k^p,$$

implying that

$$n_k a_k^p \left((n_k/(l+1))^{p-1} - 1 \right) \geq n_1 a_1^p \left(1 - (n_1/l)^{p-1} \right).$$

In view of $p > 1$, $(n_k/(l+1))^{p-1} - 1 > 0$ and $1 - (n_1/l)^{p-1} > 0$, we obtain

$$\frac{n_k a_k^p}{n_1 a_1^p} \geq \frac{1 - (n_1/l)^{p-1}}{(n_k/(l+1))^{p-1} - 1}.$$

Now, in view of $1 < p \leq 9/8$, Bernoulli's inequality gives

$$\left(\frac{n_1}{l}\right)^{p-1} = \left(1 - \frac{l - n_1}{l}\right)^{p-1} < 1 - \frac{(p-1)(l-n_1)}{l},$$

and so

$$\left(\frac{n_k}{l+1}\right)^{p-1} = \left(1 + \frac{n_k - l - 1}{l+1}\right)^{p-1} < 1 + \frac{(p-1)(n_k - l - 1)}{l+1}.$$

Hence, in view of $l - n_1 = n_k - l - 1$, we see that

$$\frac{n_k a_k^p}{n_1 a_1^p} > \frac{l+1}{l}.$$

Since $n_1 a_1^p + n_k a_k^p = c$, it is easy to show that

$$n_1 a_1^p n_k a_k^p < \frac{l(l+1)}{(2l+1)^2} c^2,$$

and so,

$$a_1 a_k < \left(\frac{l(l+1)}{n_1 n_k}\right)^{1/p} \left(\frac{c}{2l+1}\right)^{2/p}.$$

This, together with (13), implies that

$$\left(\frac{l(l+1)}{n_1 n_k}\right)^{1/p} > \frac{l(l+1)}{n_1 n_k},$$

which is a contradiction, since $l(l+1) > n_1 n_k$ and $1/p < 1$. Theorem 2 is proved. □

2.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof Let $[x_i]$ be a nonnegative eigenvector to $\lambda^{(p)}(G)$. The PM inequality implies that

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) = r! \sum_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_r\}\in E(G)} x_{i_1}\cdots x_{i_r} \le r!e(G)^{1-1/p}\left(\sum_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_r\}\in E(G)} x_{i_1}^p\cdots x_{i_r}^p\right)^{1/p}.$$

Now, letting $\mathbf{y} = (x_1^p,\ldots,x_n^p)$, Theorem 1 implies that

$$\sum_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_r\}\in E(G)} x_{i_1}^p\cdots x_{i_r}^p \le \binom{k}{r}k^{-r}.$$

Let G_2 be the 2-section of G, that is to say $V(G_2) = V(G)$ and $E(G_2)$ is the set of all 2-subsets of edges of G. Every edge of G corresponds to unique r-clique in G_2, so the number of r-cliques $k_r(G_2)$ of G_2 satisfies $k_r(G_2) \ge e(G)$. On the other hand, clearly G_2 is k-partite, and so it contains no K_{k+1}. By Zykov's theorem [13] (see also Erdős [4]),

$$k_r(G_2) \le k_r(T_k(n)) \le \binom{k}{r}\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^r, \tag{14}$$

with equality holding if and only if $k|n$ and $G_2 = T_k(n)$. We get

$$e(G) \le \binom{k}{r}\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^r,$$

with equality holding if and only if $k|n$ and $G = T_k^r(n)$. Therefore,

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) \le r!\left(\binom{k}{r}\left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^r\right)^{1-1/p}\left(\binom{k}{r}k^{-r}\right)^{1/p},$$

implying inequality (10).

If equality holds in (10), then equality holds in (14), and so $k|n$ and $G = T_k^r(n)$. □

2.4 Proof of Theorem 4

For the proof of the theorem we shall need a few general statements.

Proposition 13 *Let $r \ge 3$ and G be a complete k-chromatic r-graph and $[x_i]$ be a nonnegative vector to $\lambda^{(1)}(G)$. If the vertices u and v belong to the same vertex class U, then $x_u = x_v$.*

Proof As in Lemma 10 note that

$$P_G([x_i]) = x_uA + x_vA + x_ux_vB + C,$$

where A, B, C are independent of x_u and x_v. Assume that $x_u \ne x_v$ and define a vector $[x_i']$ such that

$$x_u' = x_v' = \frac{x_u + x_v}{2},\ x_i' = x_i \ \text{ if } \ i \in [n]\setminus\{u,v\}.$$

Clearly $x_1' + \cdots + x_n' = x_1 + \cdots + x_n = 1$, while

$$P_G\left(\left[x_i'\right]\right) - P_G\left([x_i]\right) = \frac{\left(x_u - x_v\right)^2}{4} B \geq 0.$$

To complete the proof we shall show that $B > 0$, which will contradict that $P_G\left([x_i']\right) \leq P_G\left([x_i]\right)$. Choose an edge $\{i_1, \ldots, i_r\}$ with $x_{i_1} > 0, \ldots, x_{i_r} > 0$. Obviously, the set $\{i_1, \ldots, i_r\} \setminus \{u, v\}$ contains a vertex not in U, say i_r. By symmetry, we can assume that $\{u, v\} \cap \{i_3, \ldots, i_r\} = \varnothing$, and hence the set $\{u, v, i_3, \ldots, i_r\}$ is an edge of G. Now

$$B \geq x_{i_3} \cdots x_{i_r} > 0$$

as claimed. □

Proposition 14 *Let $r \geq 3$ and G be a complete k-chromatic r-graph. If $p \geq 1$, then every nonnegative eigenvector to $\lambda^{(p)}(G)$ is positive.*

Proof Let $[x_i]$ be a nonnegative eigenvector to $\lambda^{(p)}(G)$. In view of the previous proposition and Lemma 10, all entries of $[x_i]$ belonging to the same vertex class are equal, so if an entry is zero, then all entries in the same vertex class are zero. Let G' be the the graph induced by the vertices with positive entries in $[x_i]$. Clearly G' is complete l-chromatic, where $r \leq l < k$. If all parts of G' are of size at most $r-1$, then G' is a complete graph of order say m. Then G contains a complete graph of order $m+1$, so we have

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) \geq \lambda^{(p)}\left(K_{m+1}^r\right) > \lambda^{(p)}\left(K_m^r\right) = \lambda^{(p)}\left(G'\right) = \lambda^{(p)}(G),$$

a contradiction. So G' contains a partition set of size at least r. Let i belong to a vertex class U of size at least r, and let j be a vertex such that x_j is 0, that is to say, $j \notin V(G')$. Set $x_j = x_i$ and $x_i = 0$, and write $\mathbf{x}'$ for the resulting vector. Obviously $|\mathbf{x}'|_p = 1$, but we shall show that $P_G(\mathbf{x}') > P_G(\mathbf{x})$. Indeed, if $\{i_1, \ldots, i_{r-1}\} \subset V(G')$ is such that $\{i, i_1, \ldots, i_{r-1}\} \in E(G')$, then $\{j, i_1, \ldots, i_{r-1}\} \in E(G)$. However, if $\{i_1, \ldots, i_{r-1}\} \subset U \setminus \{i\}$, then $\{j, i_1, \ldots, i_{r-1}\} \in E(G)$, but $\{i, i_1, \ldots, i_{r-1}\} \notin E(G')$. Since $x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_{r-1}} > 0$, we see that $P_G(\mathbf{x}') > P_G(\mathbf{x})$. This contradiction completes the proof of Proposition 14. □

Now we are ready to carry out the proof of Theorem 4.

Proof of Theorem 4 Let G be a k-chromatic 3-graph of order n with maximum p-spectral radius. Propositions 14 and 12 imply that G is complete k-chromatic; let $V_1, \ldots, V_k$ be the vertex sets of G; for every $i \in [k]$, set $|V_i| = n_i$ and suppose that $n_1 \leq \cdots \leq n_k$. Assume for a contradiction that $n_k - n_1 \geq 2$. Proposition 14 implies that $\mathbf{x}$ is a positive eigenvector to $\lambda^{(p)}(G)$, and Proposition 13 implies that all entries belonging to the same partition set are equal. For each $i \in [k]$ write a_i for the value of the entries in V_i. Clearly

$$P_G(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} \left(\binom{n_i}{2} n_j a_i^2 a_j + \binom{n_j}{2} n_i a_j^2 a_i \right) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j < m \leq k} n_i n_j n_m a_i a_j a_m.$$

Set

$$S_1 = \sum_{1<i<j<k} \left(\binom{n_i}{2} a_i^2 + \binom{n_j}{2} a_j^2 + n_i n_j a_i a_j \right),$$

$$S_2 = \sum_{i=2}^{k-1} n_i a_i.$$

Also, set $c = n_1 a_1^p + n_k a_k^p$.

We shall exploit the following proof idea several times. We shall define a complete k-chromatic graph G' with partition $V(G') = V_1' \cup \cdots \cup V_k'$, where $V_1' \cup V_k' = V_1 \cup V_k$, and $V_i' = V_i$ for each $1 < i < k$. Thus, G' will be completely described by the numbers $m_1 = |V_1'|$ and $m_k = |V_k'|$. Next we shall define an n-vector $\mathbf{y}$ which coincides with $\mathbf{x}$ on $V_2 \cup \cdots \cup V_{k-1}$ and for every $i \in V_1'$ and $j \in V_k'$ we shall set $y_i = b_1$ and $y_j = b_k$, where b_1 and b_k are chosen so that $m_1 b_1^p + m_k b_k^p \leq c$. Thus, $\mathbf{y}$ will be completely described by the numbers b_1 and b_k . Also note that $y_1^p + \cdots + y_n^p \leq 1$. Let us define the expressions

$$P_1 = (m_1 b_1 + m_k b_k) - (n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k),$$

$$P_2 = \left((m_1 b_1 + m_k b_k)^2 - m_1 b_1^2 - m_k b_k^2 \right) - \left((n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k)^2 - n_1 a_1^2 - n_k a_k^2 \right),$$

$$P_3 = \left(\binom{m_1}{2} m_k b_1^2 b_k + \binom{m_k}{2} m_1 b_k^2 b_1 \right) - \left(\binom{n_1}{2} n_k a_1^2 a_k + \binom{n_k}{2} n_1 a_k^2 a_1 \right),$$

and note that

$$P_{G'}(\mathbf{y}) - P_G(\mathbf{x}) = P_1 S_1 + \frac{1}{2} P_2 S_2 + P_3.$$

After choosing m_1, m_k, b_1 and b_k, we shall show that $P_1 \geq 0$, $P_2 \geq 0$ and $P_3 > 0$, which contradicts the choice of G.

First, suppose that $n_k + n_1 = 2l$ for some integer l. In this case let

$$m_1 = m_k = l, \ b_1 = b_k = \left(\frac{c}{2l} \right)^{1/p} = b.$$

Note first that $P_1 \geq 0$ follows by the PM inequality

$$n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k \leq 2l \left(\frac{n_1}{2l} a_1^p + \frac{n_k}{2l} a_k^p \right)^{1/p} = 2lb. \tag{15}$$

To prove $P_2 \geq 0$ note that

$$\begin{aligned} (n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k)^2 - n_1 a_1^2 - n_k a_k^2 &\leq (n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k)^2 - \frac{1}{2l} (n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k)^2 \\ &= 2l(2l-1) \left(\frac{n_1}{2l} a_1 + \frac{n_k}{2l} a_k \right)^2 \\ &\leq 2l(2l-1) \left(\frac{n_1}{2l} a_1^p + \frac{n_k}{2l} a_k^p \right)^{2/p} = 2l(2l-1) b^2. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we shall prove that $P_3 > 0$. Let us start with the observation

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{n_1}{2} n_k a_1^2 a_k + \binom{n_k}{2} n_1 a_k^2 a_1 &= \frac{1}{2} n_1 n_k a_1 a_k (n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k - a_1 - a_k) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} n_1 n_k a_1 a_k (n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k - 2\sqrt{a_1 a_k}) \\ &\leq n_1 n_k a_1 a_k (lb - \sqrt{a_1 a_k}). \end{aligned}$$

Now, since $z\left(lb-\sqrt{z}\right)$ is increasing for$\sqrt{z}\leq 2lb/3$ and

$$\sqrt{a_1a_k}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1n_k}}\sqrt{n_1a_1n_ka_k}\leq\frac{lb}{\sqrt{n_1n_k}}\leq\frac{lb}{\sqrt{3}}<\frac{2}{3}lb,$$

we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\binom{n_1}{2}n_ka_1^2a_k+\binom{n_k}{2}n_1a_k^2a_1&\leq n_1n_k\frac{l^2b^2}{n_1n_k}\left(lb-\frac{lb}{\sqrt{n_1n_k}}\right)\\&<l^2\left(l-1\right)b^3,\end{aligned}$$

completing the proof of $P_3>0$. Hence, $P_{G'}\left(\mathbf{y}\right)>P_G\left(\mathbf{x}\right)$, contrary to the choice of G. This proves the theorem if $n_k+n_1=2l$ for some integer l.

Assume now that $n_k+n_1=2l+1$ for some integer l. This is a more difficult task, so we shall split the remaining part of the proof into two cases (A) and (B) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{(A)}\ \ p>2\ \text{or}\ \ \left(l+1\right)n_1a_1^p\leq ln_ka_k^p;\\&\text{(B)}\ \ p\leq 2\ \text{and}\ \ \left(l+1\right)n_1a_1^p>ln_ka_k^p.\end{aligned}$$

We start with (A), so assume that $p>2$ or $\left(l+1\right)n_1a_1^p\leq ln_ka_k^p$. Define G' and $\mathbf{y}$ by

$$m_1=l,\ m_k=l+1,\ b_1=b_k=\left(c/\left(2l+1\right)\right)^{1/p}=b.$$

Again we shall prove that $P_1\geq 0$, $P_2\geq 0$ and $P_3>0$. First, the PM inequality implies that

$$n_1a_1+n_ka_k\leq\left(2l+1\right)\left(\frac{n_1}{2l+1}a_1^p+\frac{n_k}{2l+1}a_k^p\right)^{1/p}=\left(2l+1\right)b,$$

so $P_1\geq 0$. Next

$$\begin{aligned}\left(n_1a_1+n_ka_k\right)^2-n_1a_1^2-n_ka_k^2&\leq\left(n_1a_1+n_ka_k\right)^2-\frac{1}{2l+1}\left(n_1a_1+n_ka_k\right)^2\\&=2l\left(2l+1\right)\left(\frac{n_1}{2l+1}a_1+\frac{n_k}{2l+1}a_k\right)^2\\&\leq 2l\left(2l+1\right)b^2.\end{aligned}$$

so $P_2\geq 0$. To prove that $P_3>0$, note that

$$\begin{aligned}\binom{n_1}{2}n_ka_1^2a_k+\binom{n_k}{2}n_1a_k^2a_1&=\frac{1}{2}n_1n_ka_1a_k\left(n_1a_1+n_ka_k-a_1-a_k\right)\\&\leq\frac{1}{2}n_1n_ka_1a_k\left(n_1a_1+n_ka_k-2\sqrt{a_1a_k}\right)\\&\leq n_1n_ka_1a_k\left(lb-\sqrt{a_1a_k}\right).\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

Our goal now is to bound from above the right side of (16). Since the expression $z\left(lb-\sqrt{z}\right)$ is increasing for$\sqrt{z}\leq 2lb/3$, we focus on an upper bound on $\sqrt{a_1a_k}$. To this end recall that the condition of case (A) is a disjunction of two clauses. If the second one is true, i.e., if $\left(l+1\right)n_1a_1^p\leq ln_ka_k^p$, then

$$n_1a_1^p\leq\frac{l}{2l+1}c\ \ \text{and}\ \ n_ka_k^p\geq\frac{l+1}{2l+1}c,$$

and we find that

$$n_1 a_1^p n_k a_k^p = \left(\frac{c}{2} - \left(\frac{c}{2} - n_1 a_1^p\right)\right)\left(\frac{c}{2} + \left(\frac{c}{2} - n_1 a_1^p\right)\right) = \frac{c^2}{4} - \left(\frac{c}{2} - n_1 a_1^p\right)^2$$
$$\leq \frac{c^2}{4} - \frac{c^2}{4\left(2l+1\right)^2} = \frac{l\left(l+1\right)}{\left(2l+1\right)^2} c^2.$$

Hence,

$$\sqrt{a_1 a_k} \leq \left(\sqrt{n_1 n_k}\right)^{-1/p} \left(\frac{\sqrt{l\left(l+1\right)}}{2l+1}\right)^{1/p} c^{1/p} = \left(\frac{l\left(l+1\right)}{n_1 n_k}\right)^{1/2p} b.$$

Also, in view of $n_1 n_k \geq 4$ and $l \geq 2$, we see that

$$\sqrt{a_1 a_k} \leq \left(\frac{l\left(l+1\right)}{n_1 n_k}\right)^{1/2p} b < \left(\frac{l\left(l+1\right)}{1 \cdot 4}\right)^{1/2} b \leq \left(\frac{3l^2}{8}\right)^{1/2} b < \frac{2lb}{3}.$$

Hence, to bound the right side of (16) we replace$\sqrt{a_1 a_k}$ by $\left(\frac{l(l+1)}{n_1 n_k}\right)^{1/2p} b$, thus obtaining

$$\binom{n_1}{2} n_k a_1^2 a_k + \binom{n_k}{2} n_1 a_k^2 a_1 \leq n_1 n_k \left(\frac{l\left(l+1\right)}{n_1 n_k}\right)^{1/p} b^2 \left(\frac{2l+1}{2} b - \left(\frac{l\left(l+1\right)}{n_1 n_k}\right)^{1/2p} b\right)$$
$$< l\left(l+1\right) b^2 \left(\frac{2l+1}{2} b - b\right) = \frac{l\left(l+1\right)\left(2l-1\right)}{2} b^3.$$

Hence $P_3 > 0$ and $P_{G'}\left(\mathbf{y}\right) > P_G\left(\mathbf{x}\right)$, contrary to the choice of G. This completes the proof of (A) if $\left(l+1\right) n_1 a_1^p \leq l n_k a_k^p$. To finish the proof in case (A), assume that $p > 2$. Then

$$\sqrt{4 n_1 a_1^p n_k a_k^p} \leq c = \left(2l+1\right) b^p,$$

and we find that

$$\sqrt{a_1 a_k} \leq \left(\frac{2l+1}{\sqrt{4 n_1 n_k}}\right)^{1/p} b. \tag{17}$$

Also, in view of $n_1 n_k \geq 4$ and $l \geq 2$, we see that

$$\sqrt{a_1 a_k} \leq \left(\frac{2l+1}{\sqrt{4 n_1 n_k}}\right)^{1/p} b \leq \left(\frac{2l+1}{\sqrt{4 \cdot 4}}\right)^{1/p} b < \left(\frac{2l+1}{4}\right)^{1/2} b < \frac{2lb}{3}.$$

Hence, to bound the right side of (16) we replace$\sqrt{a_1 a_k}$ by $\left(\frac{2l+1}{\sqrt{4n_1 n_k}}\right)^{1/p} b$, thus obtaining

$$\binom{n_1}{2} n_k a_1^2 a_k + \binom{n_k}{2} n_1 a_k^2 a_1 \leq \frac{n_1 n_k}{2} \left(\frac{\left(2l+1\right)^2}{4 n_1 n_k}\right)^{1/p} b^2 \left(\left(2l+1\right) b - 2\left(\frac{2l+1}{\sqrt{4 n_1 n_k}}\right)^{1/p} b\right)$$
$$< \frac{\left(n_1 n_k\right)^{1-1/p}}{2} \left(\frac{\left(2l+1\right)^2}{4}\right)^{1/p} \left(2l-1\right) b^3.$$

To complete the proof we shall show that

$$\left(n_1 n_k\right)^{1-1/p} \left(\frac{\left(2l+1\right)^2}{4}\right)^{1/p} \leq l\left(l+1\right).$$

Assume that this fails, that is to say,

$$\left(\frac{(2l+1)^2}{4l\,(l+1)}\right)^{1/p} > \left(\frac{l\,(l+1)}{(n_1 n_k)}\right)^{1-1/p}.$$

Hence, we find that

$$1+\frac{1}{4l\,(l+1)} = \frac{(2l+1)^2}{4l\,(l+1)} > \left(\frac{l\,(l+1)}{(n_1 n_k)}\right)^{p-1} \geq \frac{l\,(l+1)}{(l-1)\,(l+2)} = 1+\frac{2}{(l-1)\,(l+2)},$$

which is false for $l \geq 2$. Hence, $P_{G'}(\mathbf{y}) > P_G(\mathbf{x})$, contrary to the choice of G. This completes the proof of case (A).

Now consider case (B). This time, define G' and $\mathbf{y}$ by

$$m_1 = l,\ m_k = l+1,\ b_1 = \frac{n_1 a_1}{l},\ b_k = \frac{n_k a_k}{l+1}.$$

Our first goal is to show that

$$l b_1^p + (l+1)\, b_k^p \leq n_1 a_1^p + n_k a_k^p,$$

that is to say

$$\frac{n_1^p a_1^p}{l^{p-1}} + \frac{n_k^p a_k^p}{(l+1)^{p-1}} \leq n_1 a_1^p + n_k a_k^p. \tag{18}$$

Assume for a contradiction that

$$\frac{n_k^p a_k^p}{(l+1)^{p-1}} - n_k a_k^p > n_1 a_1^p - \frac{n_1^p a_1^p}{l^{p-1}},$$

implying that

$$\frac{n_1 a_1^p}{n_k a_k^p} < \frac{\left(\frac{n_k}{l+1}\right)^{p-1} - 1}{1-\left(\frac{n_1}{l}\right)^{p-1}}.$$

Set $s = n_k - l - 1 = l - n_1$ and note that $p-1 \leq 1$. Then, Bernoulli's inequality implies that

$$\frac{n_1 a_1^p}{n_k a_k^p} < \frac{\left(\frac{n_k}{l+1}\right)^{p-1} - 1}{1-\left(\frac{n_1}{l}\right)^{p-1}} = \frac{\left(1+\frac{s}{l+1}\right)^{p-1} - 1}{1-\left(1-\frac{s}{l}\right)^{p-1}} \leq \frac{\frac{s}{l+1}}{\frac{s}{l}} = \frac{l}{l+1},$$

contrary to the assumption of case (B). Therefore, (18) holds.

Next, obviously $P_1 = 0$; we shall show that $P_2 \geq 0$ and $P_3 > 0$. Indeed,

$$(n_1 a_1 + n_k a_k)^2 - n_1 a_1^2 - n_k a_k^2 = (l b_1 + (l+1)\, b_k)^2 - n_1 a_1^2 - n_k a_k^2,$$

so to prove that $P_2 \geq 0$ it is enough to show that

$$n_1 a_1^2 + n_k a_k^2 \geq l b_1^2 + (l+1)\, b_k^2 = \frac{n_1^2 a_1^2}{l} + \frac{n_k^2 a_k^2}{l+1}.$$

If this inequality failed, then

$$n_1 a_1^2 - \frac{n_1^2 a_1^2}{l} < \frac{n_k^2 a_k^2}{l+1} - n_k a_k^2,$$

and, in view of $n_k l > (l+1) n_1$ and $1/2 \leq 1/p$, we obtain

$$\frac{a_1}{a_k} < \left(\frac{n_k l}{(l+1) n_1}\right)^{1/2} \leq \left(\frac{n_k l}{(l+1) n_1}\right)^{1/p},$$

contrary to the assumption of case (B). Therefore, $P_2 \geq 0$.

Finally, to prove $P_3 > 0$, note that $n_1 n_k a_1 a_k = l(l+1) b_1 b_k$ and we only need to prove that

$$\begin{aligned}(n_1 - 1) a_1 + (n_k - 1) a_k &< (l-1) b_1 + l b_k \\ &= (l-1) \frac{n_1 a_1}{l} + l \frac{n_k a_k}{l+1} \\ &= n_1 a_1 - \frac{n_1 a_1}{l} + n_k a_k - \frac{n_k a_k}{l+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Indeed if the latter were false, we would have

$$\frac{n_k - l - 1}{l+1} a_k = \frac{n_k a_k}{l+1} - a_k \geq a_1 - \frac{n_1 a_1}{l} = \frac{l - n_1}{l} a_1,$$

and so $a_1/a_k \leq l/(l+1)$, contrary to the assumption of (B). Therefore, $P_3 > 0$ and $P_{G'}(\mathbf{y}) > P_G(\mathbf{x})$, contrary to the choice of G. This completes the proof of case (B).

In summary, the assumption $|n_1 - n_k| \geq 2$ contradicts that G has maximum p-spectral radius among the k-chromatic 3-graphs of order n. Theorem 4 is proved. □

2.5 Proof of theorem 5

It is convenient to prove a more abstract statement first.

Theorem 15 *Let $[n_i]$ be a real k-vector such that $n_i \geq 1$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$ and $n_1 + \cdots + n_k = n \geq k$ and let $[a_i]$ be a nonnegative k-vector with $n_1 a_1 + \cdots + n_k a_k = s$. Then the function*

$$R([n_i], [a_i]) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq k} \left(\binom{n_i}{2} n_j a_i^2 a_j + \binom{n_j}{2} n_i a_j^2 a_i \right) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j < m \leq k} n_i n_j n_m a_i a_j a_m.$$

satisfies

$$R([n_i], [a_i]) \leq \left(\binom{n}{3} - k \binom{n/k}{3} \right) \frac{s^3}{n^3},$$

with equality holding if and only if $n_1 = \cdots = n_k$ and $a_1 = \cdots = a_k$.

To simplify the proof of Theorem 15 we prove an auxiliary statement first.

Proposition 16 *If $n_1 = \cdots = n_k = l \geq 1$, and the k-vector $[a_i]$ satisfies $a_1 + \cdots + a_k = t$, then*

$$R([n_i], [a_i]) < \left(\binom{kl}{3} - k \binom{l}{3} \right) \frac{t^3}{k^3},$$

unless $a_1 = \cdots = a_k$.

Proof Since $R([n_i],[a_i])$ is homogenous of degree 3 with respect to $[a_i]$, without loss of generality we may assume that $t=1$. Also, let us note that

$$\left(\binom{kl}{3}-k\binom{l}{3}\right)\frac{1}{k^3}=\frac{l}{6}\cdot\frac{(lk-1)(lk-2)-(l-1)(l-2)}{k^2}$$
$$=\frac{l^2}{6}\left(l\left(1-\frac{1}{k^2}\right)-\frac{3(k-1)}{k^2}\right),$$

and furthermore if $a_1=\cdots=a_k$, then indeed

$$R([n_i],[a_i])=\frac{l^2}{6}\cdot k\cdot\frac{1}{k}\left(1-\frac{1}{k}\right)\left((l-3)\frac{1}{k}+l\right)=\left(\binom{kl}{3}-k\binom{l}{3}\right)\frac{1}{k^3}.$$

We shall prove the proposition by induction on k. For $k=2$, the AM-GM inequality implies that

$$R([n_i],[a_i])=\frac{l^2(l-1)}{2}a_1a_2(a_1+a_2)\le\frac{l^2(l-1)}{8}=\frac{l^2}{6}\left(l\left(1-\frac{1}{4}\right)-\frac{3}{4}\right),$$

so the assertion holds. Assume that $k>2$ and that the assertion holds for all $k'<k$. Let $R([n_i],[a_i])$ attain maximum for some vector $[a_i]$ with $a_1+\cdots+a_k=1$. If $a_i=0$ for some $i\in[k]$, then, by the induction assumption, and in view of $l\ge1$ and $k\ge3$,

$$R([n_i],[a_i])\le\frac{l^2}{6}\left(l\left(1-\frac{1}{(k-1)^2}\right)-\frac{3(k-2)}{(k-1)^2}\right)<\frac{l^2}{6}\left(l\left(1-\frac{1}{k^2}\right)-\frac{3(k-1)}{k^2}\right),$$

proving the assertion. So we shall assume that $a_i>0$ for all $i\in[k]$.

Our next task is to rewrite $R([n_i],[a_i])$ in a more convenient form. Note that

$$R([n_i],[a_i])=\frac{l^2(l-1)}{2}\sum_{1\le i<j\le k}\left(a_i^2a_j+a_j^2a_i\right)+l^3\sum_{1\le i<j<m\le k}a_ia_ja_m$$
$$=\frac{l^2}{2}\left((l-1)\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_i^2(1-a_i)+2l\sum_{1\le i<j<m\le k}a_ia_ja_m\right).$$

Also, it is not hard to see that

$$2l\sum_{1\le i<j<m\le k}a_ia_ja_m=\frac{2l}{3}\sum_{1\le i<j\le k}a_ia_j(1-a_i-a_j)$$
$$=\frac{2l}{3}\sum_{1\le i<j\le k}a_ia_j-\frac{2l}{3}\sum_{1\le i<j\le k}a_ia_j(a_i+a_j)$$
$$=\frac{l}{3}\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_i(1-a_i)-\frac{2l}{3}\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_i^2(1-a_i)$$
$$=\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_i(1-a_i)\left(\frac{l}{3}-\frac{2l}{3}a_i\right).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} R\left([n_i],[a_i]\right) &= \frac{l^2}{2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k}(l-1)\,a_i^2\,(1-a_i)+\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_i\,(1-a_i)\left(\frac{l}{3}-\frac{2l}{3}a_i\right)\right) \\ &= \frac{l^2}{6}\sum_{i=1}^{k}a_i\,(1-a_i)\,((l-3)\,a_i+l) \\ &= \frac{l^2}{6}\sum_{i=1}^{k}f\left(a_i\right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$f\left(x\right)=x\,(1-x)\,((l-3)\,x+l)\,.$$

The second derivative of $f\left(x\right)$ is $6\,(3-l)\,x-6$; and so if $l\geq 2$, then $f''\left(x\right)<0$ for $0<x<1$; that is to say, if $l\geq 2$, then $f\left(x\right)$ is concave for $0<x<1$; and hence $R\left([n_i],[a_i]\right)$ attaines maximum if and only if $a_1=\cdots=a_k$.

Fianlly, let $l<2$. By the Lagrange method, there exists λ such that $f'\left(a_i\right)=\lambda$ for all $i\in[k]$. Hence, if $a_i\neq a_j$, then a_i and a_j are the two roots of the quadratic equation

$$l-6x-3\,(l-3)\,x^2=\lambda,$$

and so

$$a_i+a_j=-\frac{-6}{-3\,(l-3)}=\frac{2}{3-l}>1,$$

a contradiction, showing that $a_1=\cdots=a_k$. The induction step is completed and Proposition 16 is proved. □

Proof of Theorem 15 Since R is continuous in each variable $n_1,\ldots,n_k,a_1,\ldots,a_k$, and its domain is compact, it attains a maximum for some $n_1,\ldots,n_k$ and $a_1,\ldots,a_k$. First we shall prove the statement under the assumption that all $a_1,\ldots,a_k$ are positive. Also, by symmetry, we assume that $n_1\leq\cdots\leq n_k$. Our proof is by contradiction, so assume that $n_1<n_k$ and set

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{1<i<j<k}\left(\binom{n_i}{2}a_i^2+\binom{n_j}{2}a_j^2+n_in_ja_ia_j\right), \\ S_2 &= \sum_{i=2}^{k-1}n_ia_i, \\ c &= n_1a_1+n_ka_k, \\ l &= (n_1+n_k)\,/2, \end{aligned}$$

The proof proceeds along the following line: we replace $[n_i]$ and $[a_i]$ by two k-vectors $[m_i]$ and $[b_i]$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} m_1=m_k=l,\ \ m_i=n_i,\ \ 1<i<k, \\ b_1=b_k=\frac{c}{2l},\ b_i=a_i,\ \ 1<i<k. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly $[m_i]$ and $[b_i]$ satisfy the conditions for $[n_i]$ and $[a_i]$, but we shall show that

$$R([m_i],[b_i]) > R([n_i],[a_i]),$$

which is a contradiction, due to the assumption that $n_1 < n_k$.

To carry out this strategy, let

$$\begin{aligned}
R_1 &= (lb_1 + lb_k) - (n_1a_1 + n_ka_k),\\
R_2 &= \left((lb_1 + lb_k)^2 - lb_1^2 - lb_k^2\right) - \left((n_1a_1 + n_ka_k)^2 - n_1a_1^2 - n_ka_k^2\right),\\
R_3 &= \left(\binom{l}{2} lb_1^2b_k + \binom{l}{2} lb_k^2b_1\right) - \left(\binom{n_1}{2} n_ka_1^2a_k + \binom{n_k}{2} n_1a_k^2a_1\right).
\end{aligned}$$

and note that

$$R([m_i],[b_i]) - R([n_i],[a_i]) = R_1S_1 + \frac{1}{2}R_2S_2 + R_3.$$

Obviously $R_1 = 0$; we shall prove that $R_2 \geq 0$ and $R_3 > 0$. Indeed,

$$n_1a_1^2 + n_ka_k^2 \geq 2l\left(\frac{n_1}{2l}a_1 + \frac{n_k}{2l}a_k\right)^2 = lb_1^2 + lb_k^2,$$

and this together with $R_1 = 0$, implies that $R_2 \geq 0$. Finally note that

$$a_1a_k \leq \frac{c^2}{4n_1n_k}$$

and so,

$$\begin{aligned}
n_1n_ka_1a_k(n_1a_1 + n_ka_k - a_1 - a_k) &\leq n_1n_ka_1a_k(c - 2\sqrt{a_1a_k})\\
&\leq \frac{c^2}{4}\left(c - \frac{c}{\sqrt{n_1n_k}}\right) < \frac{c^3}{4}\left(1 - \frac{1}{l}\right)\\
&= l^2b_1b_k(l-1)(b_1 + b_k).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $R([m_i],[b_i]) > R([n_i],[a_i])$, a contradiction showing that $n_1 = \cdots = n_k$. This completes the proof if all $a_1, \ldots, a_k$ are positive.

In the general case assume that $a_1 > 0, \ldots, a_s > 0$, $a_{s+1} = \cdots = a_k = 0$. By what we already proved, we have $n_1 = \cdots = n_s$, and Proposition 16 implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
R([n_i],[a_i]) &\leq \binom{m}{3}\frac{1}{m^3} - s\binom{m/s}{3}\frac{1}{m^3} = \frac{(s-1)}{6s^2}\left((s+1) - \frac{3s}{m}\right)\\
&\leq \binom{n}{3}\frac{1}{n^3} - s\binom{n/s}{3}\frac{1}{n^3} < \binom{n}{3}\frac{1}{n^3} - k\binom{n/k}{3}\frac{1}{n^3}.
\end{aligned}$$

An easy inspection shows that equality holds if and only if $s = k$. Theorem 15 is proved. □

Proof of Theorem 5 Since (I) is a particular case of Proposition 6, we proceed directly with (II). For $p = 1$ the assertion follows from Theorem 15. Let $p > 1$ and let $[x_i]$ be a positive eigenvector to $\lambda^{(p)}(G)$. The PM inequality implies that

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) = r! \sum_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_r\}\in E(G)} x_{i_1}\cdots x_{i_r} \leq r!e(G)^{1-1/p}\left(\sum_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_r\}\in E(G)} x_{i_1}^p\cdots x_{i_r}^p\right)^{1/p}. \tag{19}$$

Now, letting $\mathbf{y} := (x_1^p, \ldots, x_n^p)$, Theorem 15 implies that

$$\sum_{\{i_1,\ldots,i_r\}\in E(G)} x_{i_1}^p \cdots x_{i_r}^p \leq \left(\binom{n}{3} - k\binom{n/k}{3}\right)\frac{1}{n^3}.$$

On the other hand, G must be complete k-chromatic, say with vertex classes of sizes $n_1, \ldots, n_k$. Define the function

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x \leq 2 \\ \binom{x}{3}, & \text{if } x > 2 \end{cases},$$

and note that $f(x)$ is convex. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} e(G) &= \binom{n}{3} - \sum_{i=1}^{k}\binom{n_i}{3} = \binom{n}{3} - \sum_{i=1}^{k} f(n_i) \leq \binom{n}{3} - kf\binom{n/k}{3} \\ &= \binom{n}{3} - k\binom{n/k}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

We used above the fact that $n > 2k$.

Hence, replacing $e(G)$ in the right side of (19), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{(p)}(G) &\leq 3!\left(\binom{n}{3} - k\binom{n/k}{3}\right)^{1-1/p}\left(\binom{n}{3} - k\binom{n/k}{3}\right)^{1/p} n^{-3/p} \\ &= 3!\left(\binom{n}{3} - k\binom{n/k}{3}\right) n^{-3/p}. \end{aligned}$$

If equality holds, then we must have also

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} f(n_i) = kf(n/k).$$

An easy inspection shows this can happen only if $n_1 = \cdots = n_k = n/k$. Therefore, $k|n$ and $G = Q_k^r(n)$. □

2.6 Proof of Theorem 9

Proof The key to our proof is an appropriate bound on $\lambda^{(1)}(G)$. Let G be k-chromatic r-graph of order n with maximum $\lambda^{(1)}$. Propositions 14 and 12 imply that G is complete k-chromatic; let $V_1, \ldots, V_k$ be the vertex sets of G; for each $i \in [k]$, set $|V_i| = n_i$.

Let $[x_i]$ be a nonnegative eigenvector to $\lambda^{(1)}(G)$; Proposition 13 implies that all entries belonging to the same partition set are equal, so for each $i \in [k]$, let a_i be the value of the entries in V_i.

Write $V^{[r]}$ for the set of r-permutations of V, that is to say, the set of all vectors $(i_1, \ldots, i_r) \in V^r$ with distinct entries. Note that

$$P_G([x_i]) = \sum\left\{x_{i_1}\cdots x_{i_r} : (i_1, \ldots, i_r) \in V^{[r]} \text{ and } (i_1, \ldots, i_r) \notin V_j^r,\ j = 1, \ldots, k\right\}.$$

Hence, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} P_G([x_i]) &\le \sum \left\{ x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r} : (i_1, \ldots, i_r) \in V^r \text{ and } (i_1, \ldots, i_r) \notin V_j^r,\ j = 1, \ldots, k \right\} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \right)^r - \sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum \left\{ x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r} : (i_1, \ldots, i_r) \in V_j^r \right\} \\ &= 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{k} (n_j a_j)^r \le 1 - k \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^{k} n_j a_j \right)^r = 1 - k^{-r+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\lambda^{(1)}(G) \le 1 - k^{-r+1}.$$

Let now $p > 1$, and let $[x_i]$ be a nonnegative eigenvector to $\lambda^{(p)}(G)$. The PM inequality implies that

$$\lambda^{(p)}(G) = r! \sum_{\{i_1, \ldots, i_r\} \in E(G)} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_r} \le r! e(G)^{1-1/p} \left(\sum_{\{i_1, \ldots, i_r\} \in E(G)} x_{i_1}^p \cdots x_{i_r}^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

Now, letting $\mathbf{y} := (x_1^p, \ldots, x_n^p)$, we see that

$$\sum_{\{i_1, \ldots, i_r\} \in E(G)} x_{i_1}^p \cdots x_{i_r}^p \le \frac{\lambda^{(1)}(G)}{r!} \le \frac{\left(1 - k^{-r+1}\right)}{r!},$$

implying inequality (11). Now, to get inequality (12), notice that

$$r! e(G) \le r! \binom{n}{r} - k r! \binom{n/k}{r} < n^r \left(1 - \frac{1}{k^{-r+1}} \right),$$

and (12) follows from (11). □

2.7 Acknowledgement

Part of this work has been done, while the second author was visiting Shanghai University and Hong Kong Polytechnic University in the Fall of 2013. He is grateful for the outstanding hospitality of these institutions. The research of the first author was supported by some grants (No. 11171207, No. 91130032), and by a grant of "The First-class Discipline of Universities in Shanghai". The research of the third author was supported by National Science Foundation of China (No. 11101263), and by a grant of "The First-class Discipline of Universities in Shanghai".

References

[1] C. Berge, Hypergraphs, combinatorics of finite sets, North-Holland, 1989.

[2] D. Cvetković, Chromatic number and the spectrum of a graph, *Publ. Inst. Math. (Beograd)* **14 (28)** (1972), 25-38.

[3] C. Edwards and C. Elphick, Lower bounds for the clique and the chromatic number of a graph, *Discr. Appl. Math.* **5** (1983), 51-64.

[4] P. Erdős, On the number of complete subgraphs contained in certain graphs, *Publ. Math. Inst. Hung. Acad. Sci.* **VII**, Ser. A3 (1962), 459-464.

[5] L. Feng, Q. Li, and X.D. Zhang, Spectral radii of graphs with given chromatic number, *Appl. Math. Lett.* **20**, (2007), 158-162.

[6] G.H. Hardy, J.E. Littlewood, and G. Pólya, *Inequalities, 2nd edition*, Cambridge University Press, 1988, vi+324 pp.

[7] P. Keevash, J. Lenz, and D. Mubayi, Spectral extremal problems for hypergraphs. Preprint available at *arXiv:1304.0050.*

[8] T. Motzkin and E. Straus, Maxima for graphs and a new proof of a theorem of Turán. *Canad. J. Math.,* **17**, (1965), 533-540.

[9] D. Mubayi and J. Talbot, Extremal problems for t-partite and t-colorable hypergraphs, *Electron. J. Combin.* **15** (2008), R26.

[10] V. Nikiforov, An analytic theory of extremal hypergraph problems. Preprint available at *arXiv:1305.1073v2.*

[11] V. Nikiforov, Analytic methods for uniform hypergraphs. Preprint available at *arXiv:1308.1654v3.*

[12] V. Nikiforov, Some extremal problems for hereditary properties of graphs, *Electron. J. Combin.* **21**, (2014), P1.17.

[13] A. A. Zykov, On some properties of linear complexes (in Russian), *Mat. Sbornik N.S.* **24**(66), (1949), 163–188.